

Evolutionary Reformulation of Quantum Gravity

Giovanni Montani^{*†}

^{*}ICRA—International Center for Relativistic Astrophysics
Dipartimento di Fisica (G9), Università di Roma, “La Sapienza”,
Piazzale Aldo Moro 5, 00185 Rome, Italy.

[†]ENEA-C.R. Frascati (U.T.S. Fusione),
via Enrico Fermi 45, 00044 Frascati, Rome, Italy.

E-mail: montani@icra.it

We present a critical analysis of the Canonical approach to quantum gravity, which relies on the ambiguity of implementing a space-time slicing on the quantum level. We emphasize that such a splitting procedure is consistent only if a real matter fluid is involved in the dynamics.

Keywords: Quantum gravity. Schrödinger dynamics.

General Relativity is a background independent theory which identifies the gravitational interaction into the metric properties of the space-time and this peculiar nature makes very subtle even simple questions about its quantization. To deal with a canonical method for the fields dynamics necessarily involves the notion of a physical time variable, whose conjugate momentum fixes the Hamiltonian function. Already in the context of classical General Relativity, the task of recovering a physical clock acquires non-trivial character, depending on the local properties of the space-time. However, a well grounded algorithm devoted to this end was settled down by Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) in¹ It consists of a space-time slicing based on a one parameter family of spacelike hypersurfaces Σ_t^3 , defined via the parametric representation $t^\mu = t^\mu(t, x^i)$ ($\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ and $i = 1, 2, 3$). In what follows, we denote the set of coordinates $\{t, x^i\}$ by $x^{\bar{\mu}}$, in order to emphasize that the slicing procedure can be recast as a 4-diffeomorphism, i.e. $ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}(t^\rho)dt^\mu dt^\nu = \bar{g}_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}}(x^{\bar{\rho}})dx^{\bar{\mu}}dx^{\bar{\nu}}$. The main issue of adopting the coordinates $x^{\bar{\mu}}$ is that they allow to separate the 4-metric tensor into six evolutionary components, which determine the induced 3-metric tensor h_{ij} of the hypersurfaces and four Lagrangian multipliers, corresponding to the lapse function N and to the shift vector N^i . These non-evolutionary variables have a precise geometrical meaning, given by the relation $\partial_t t^\mu = N n^\mu + N^i \partial_i t^\mu$ (where $g_{\mu\nu} n^\mu n^\nu = 1$ and $g_{\mu\nu} n^\mu \partial_i t^\nu = 0$), $n^\mu(t^\rho)$ denoting the orthonormal vector to the family Σ_t^3 . The classical dynamics of the 3-metric h_{ij} is governed, in vacuum, by the following set of equations

$$G_{\mu\nu} n^\mu n^\nu = -\frac{kH}{2\sqrt{h}} = 0 \quad (1)$$

$$G_{\mu\nu} n^\mu \partial_i t^\nu = \frac{kH_i}{2\sqrt{h}} = 0 \quad (2)$$

$$G_{\mu\nu} \partial_i t^\mu \partial_j t^\nu = G_{ij} = 0, \quad (3)$$

h being the 3-metric determinant and $G_{\mu\nu}$ the Einstein tensor (H and H_i are called the super-Hamiltonian and the super-momentum respectively). The first two lines above correspond to constraints for the initial values problem and they play a crucial role in the canonical quantization of the system, while the last line fixes the evolution of the 3-metric and it is lost on the quantum level. As a consequence, the canonical quantum dynamics of the gravitational field is characterized by the so-called *frozen formalism*.² In fact the dynamics of a generic state $|g_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}}\rangle = |h_{ij}, N, N^i\rangle$ is provided by the requests

$$\hat{p}_N |h_{ij}, N, N^i\rangle = 0, \hat{p}_{N^i} |h_{ij}, N, N^i\rangle = 0 \quad (4)$$

$$\hat{H} |h_{ij}, N, N^i\rangle = 0, \hat{H}_i |h_{ij}, N, N^i\rangle = 0, \quad (5)$$

$\hat{p}_N$ and p_{N^i} being the momenta operators associated to N and N^i respectively. The four operator constraints listed above are the quantum translation of the diffeomorphisms invariance of the theory and they can be summarized by the Wheeler-DeWitt equation³ $\hat{H} |\{h_{ij}\}\rangle = 0$, where by $\{h_{ij}\}$ we denote a class of 3-geometries. The *frozen formalism* consists of the independence that the states acquires from N and N^i , i.e. the quantum picture is the same on each spacelike hypersurfaces.

This non evolutionary character of the Wheeler-DeWitt approach is striking in contrast with the Einstein equations which predict a 3-metric field evolving over the slicing. In what follows, we argue that this absence of a proper time in canonical quantum gravity is connected to the inconsistency of the 3+1-splitting referred to a quantum (vacuum) space-time. As issue of this criticism, we outline a *time-matter* dualism and provide an evolutionary re-formulation of the canonical paradigm for the gravitational field quantization.

Let us assume to have solved the quantum gravity problem in the framework of generic coordinates t^μ , having determined a complete set of orthonormal states $|g_{\mu\nu}\rangle_\alpha$ on which a given configuration $|g_{\mu\nu}\rangle$ can be decomposed as $|g_{\mu\nu}\rangle = \sum_\alpha c_\alpha |g_{\mu\nu}\rangle_\alpha$. Now, assigned a 4-vector n^μ , its norm $n \equiv g_{\mu\nu} n^\mu n^\nu$ (and therefore its timelike character too) can be established only in the sense of expectation values on the state $|g_{\mu\nu}\rangle$, having the form $\langle n \rangle = \sum_\alpha c_\alpha \langle n \rangle_\alpha \equiv s(t^\mu)$. This field s is clearly a random scalar one, whose dynamics is induced by the quantum behavior of the 4-metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. By the diffeomorphism invariance, we deal with a scalar field $s(t^\rho(x^{\bar{\mu}})) = s(t, x^i)$ on the slicing picture too. Analogous considerations hold for the quantity $n_i \equiv g_{\mu\nu} n^\mu \partial_i t^\nu$ (which states the timelike nature of n^μ in the coordinates $x^{\bar{\mu}}$) and leads to conclude that its expectation value $\langle n_i \rangle = \sum_\alpha c_\alpha \langle n_i \rangle_\alpha \equiv s_i(t^\mu)$ define in turn a random vector $s_i(t^\rho(x^{\bar{\mu}})) = s_i(t, x^i)$ living on the 3-hypersurfaces Σ_t^3 . The outcoming of these four degrees of freedom $\{s, s_i\}$ indicates that, for a quantum space-time, the slicing picture preserves the number of evolutionary variables, because we pass from $g_{\mu\nu}$ in the system t^μ to $\{h_{ij}, s, s_i\}$ in the splitting coordinates $x^{\bar{\mu}}$. In this respect N and N^i simply give the components of the vector n^μ in the 3+1-scheme. Now, the evolutionary behavior of ten variables (right the number of 4-metric components) implies that the super-Hamiltonian and the super-

momentum constraints (1) are violated in the sense of expectation values, so that $\langle k\hat{H}/2\sqrt{h} \rangle = \varepsilon$ and $\langle k\hat{H}_i/2\sqrt{h} \rangle = q_i$. Here ε and q_i denote a 3-scalar and a 3-vector field respectively. Their presence comes out because of the equation $G_{ij} = 0$, which classically ensure the existence of constraints, are lost on a quantum level. By other words, if we quantize the gravitational field before the slicing procedure is performed, then the quantum translation of the 3+1-picture can no longer be recovered and the *frozen formalism* is overcome.

The physical issue of the analysis above, leads to a *time-matter dualism* within the context of an evolutionary quantum gravity. In fact, the following two statements take place on the quantum and classical level respectively.

i) The non-vanishing behavior of the super-Hamiltonian and the super-momentum expectation values implies that the corresponding operators do not annihilate the states of the theory (like in the Wheeler-DeWitt approach) and therefore we have to deal with a schrödinger quantum dynamics of the gravitational field.⁴ More precisely, in the coordinates $x^{\bar{\mu}}$ the state acquires a dependence on the label time, i.e. it reads $|t, h_{ij}\rangle$ and it obeys the Schrödinger equation

$$i\hbar\partial_t |t, h_{ij}\rangle = \hat{\mathcal{H}} |t, h_{ij}\rangle \equiv \int_{\Sigma_t^3} d^3x \left\{ N\hat{H} + N^i\hat{H}_i \right\} |t, h_{ij}\rangle; \quad (6)$$

this equation provides the time evolution of the 3-metric states along the slicing and, once fixed the proper operator ordering to deal with an Hermitian Hamiltonian, then a standard procedure defines the Hilbert space.

ii) The classical WKB limit for $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ maps the Schrödinger dynamics above into the relaxed Hamiltonian constraints, which contain ε and q_i .⁴ By using the relations (1), the classical limit is recognized to be General Relativity in presence of an Eckart fluid,⁵ i. e.

$$G_{\mu\nu} = k(-\varepsilon n_\mu n_\nu + n_\mu q_\nu + q_\mu n_\nu), \quad q_\mu \equiv q_i h^{ij} \partial_j t^\mu; \quad (7)$$

above, h^{ij} denotes the inverse 3-metric and the 4-vector q_μ has the physical meaning of heat conductivity. Here n^μ plays the role of 4-velocity, according to the request of a physical slicing which preserves the light cone on a quantum level too. It is relevant to stress that the energy density of the Eckart fluid is positive in correspondence to the negative part of the super-Hamiltonian spectrum. Therefore, showing that such a region is predicted by the quantum dynamics acquires here a key role.

Having this idea in mind, we adopt more convenient variables to express the 3-metric tensor, i.e.

$$h_{ij} \equiv \eta^{4/3} u_{ij}, \quad (8)$$

with $\eta \equiv h^{1/4}$ and $\det u_{ij} = 1$.

Expressed via these variables, the super-Hamiltonian reads

$$H = -\frac{3}{16}c^2k p_\eta^2 + \frac{2c^2k}{\eta^2}u_{ik}u_{jl}p^{ij}p^{kl} - \frac{1}{2k}\eta^{2/3}V(u_{ij}, \nabla\eta, \nabla u_{ij}), \quad (9)$$

where p_η and p^{ij} denote the conjugate momenta to η and u_{ij} respectively, while the potential term V comes from the 3-Ricci scalar and ∇ refers to first and second order spatial gradients.

In this picture, the eigenvalue of the super-Hamiltonian operator takes the explicit form

$$\hat{H}\chi_\mathcal{E} = \left\{ \frac{3}{128\hbar ck^2} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\eta^2} - \frac{1}{4\hbar ck^2\eta^2} \Delta_u - \frac{1}{2k}\eta^{2/3}V(u_{ij}, \nabla\eta, \nabla u_{ij}) \right\} \chi_\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}\chi_\mathcal{E} \quad (10)$$

$$\Delta_u \equiv \frac{\delta}{\delta u_{ij}} u_{ik} u_{jl} \frac{\delta}{\delta u_{kl}}. \quad (11)$$

From a qualitative point of view, the existence of solutions for the system (10) with negative values of $\mathcal{E}$ can be inferred from its Klein-Gordon-like structure. However, a more quantitative analysis is allowed by taking the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$, where the system (10) admits an asymptotic solution. In fact, in this limit, the potential term is drastically suppressed with respect to the Δ_u one and the dynamics of different spatial points decouples, so reducing the quantization scheme to the local minisuperspace approach. It is easy to see that such approximate dynamics admits, point by point in space, the solution

$$\chi_\mathcal{E} = \iota_\mathcal{E}(\eta, p) G_{p^2}(u_{ij}), \quad (12)$$

ι and G_{p^2} satisfying the two equations respectively

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{\hbar ck^2} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\eta^2} + \frac{32p^2}{\hbar ck^2\eta^2} \right\} \iota_\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}\iota_\mathcal{E} \quad (13)$$

$$\Delta_u G_{p^2} = -p^2 G_{p^2}. \quad (14)$$

As far as we take $\iota = \sqrt{\eta}\theta(\eta)$ and we consider the negative part of the spectrum $\mathcal{E} = -|\mathcal{E}|$, the function θ obey the equation

$$\frac{1}{\hbar ck^2} \frac{\delta^2\theta}{\delta\eta^2} + \frac{1}{\hbar ck^2\eta} \frac{\delta\theta}{\delta\eta} + \left(|\mathcal{E}'| - \frac{q^2}{\hbar ck^2\eta^2} \right) \theta = 0 \quad (15)$$

$$q^2 \equiv \frac{1}{4} (1 - 128p^2) \quad \mathcal{E}' \equiv \hbar ck^2 \mathcal{E}. \quad (16)$$

Thus, we see that a negative part of the spectrum exists in correspondence to the solution

$$\theta(\eta, \mathcal{E}', p) = A J_q(\sqrt{|\mathcal{E}'|}\eta) + B J_{-q}(\sqrt{|\mathcal{E}'|}\eta), \quad (17)$$

where $J_{\pm q}$ denote the corresponding Bessel functions, while A and B are two integration constants.

The above analysis states that the Eckart energy density always has a (quantum) range of positive value, (associated to the negative portion of the super-Hamiltonian spectrum) near enough to the “singular” point $\eta = 0$.

However, the correspondence between ε and $\mathcal{E}/2\eta^2$ can occur only after the classical limit of the spectrum is taken.

We conclude this analysis, observing that to give a precise physical meaning to this picture, the following three points (elsewhere faced) have to be addressed.

i) The existence of a stable ground level of negative energy has to be inferred or provided by additional conditions. ii) The spatial gradients of the dynamical variables and therefore the associated super-momentum constraints, are to be included into the problem and treated in a consistent way. iii) The physical nature of the limit $\eta \rightarrow 0$ has to be clarified within a cosmological framework.⁶

We conclude by observing that reliable investigations^{6,7} provide negative components of the super-Hamiltonian spectrum which are associated to the constraint

$$|\mathcal{E}| \leq \frac{\hbar c}{l_{Pl}^4}, \quad (18)$$

where $l_{Pl} \equiv \sqrt{\frac{G\hbar}{c^3}}$ denotes the Planck length.

As shown in,⁷ this range of variation for the super-Hamiltonian eigenvalue implies, when an inflationary scenario is addressed, a negligible contribution to the actual Universe critical parameter. In fact, estimating the critical parameter associated to the new matter term, say $\Omega_{\mathcal{E}}$, we get

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{E}} \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{10^{-2}l_{Pl}}{R_0}\right) \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-60}), \quad (19)$$

$R_0 \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{28}cm)$ being the present radius of curvature of the Universe.

Therefore, by above, we see that the predictions of an evolutionary quantum cosmology phenomenologically overlap those ones of the Wheeler-DeWitt approach.

References

1. R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, in *Gravitation: an introduction to current research*, (1962), eds I. Witten and J. Wiley, New York.
2. K. Kuchar, in *Quantum Gravity II, a second Oxford symposium*, (1981), eds C. J. Isham et al., Clarendon Press., Oxford,
3. B. S. DeWitt, *Phys. Rev.*, (1967), **160**, 1113.
4. G. Montani, *Nucl. Phys. B*, (2002), **634**, 370.
5. C. Eckart, (1940), *Phys. Rev.*, **58**, 919.
6. M. V. Battisti and G. Montani, *Phys. Lett. B*, (2006), **637**, 203.
7. G. Montani, *Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. D*, (2003), **12**, n. 8, 1445.